UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,096	11/29/2000	Dennis L. Montgomery	42503 261928	6817

7590 06/02/2005

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
MAHMOUDI, HASSAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2165	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/727,096	MONTGOMERY, DENNIS L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tony Mahmoudi	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-73* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,39-53, 55-63 and 67-73* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *17-38,54 and 64-66* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 17-March-2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

   To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

   (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

   (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

   If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

2. Claims 1-73 are pending in the application, of which, claims 1, 39, 40 and 46 are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 16, and 47-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289 B1) in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657 B1.)

As to claim 1, Johns teaches a method of operating upon digital data (see Abstract) comprising the steps of:

operating upon each of the plurality of first threads to obtain a plurality of compressed first threads (see column 6, lines 3-6), each compressed first thread including at least one compressed block of digital data (see column 7, lines 62-66, and see column 16, lines 8-13.)

Johns does not teach:

partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and

creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks.

Wang et al teaches system and process for delivering digital data on demand (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks (see column 16, lines 50-65 and see column 25, lines 3-5); and

creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks (see figure 1B; see column 10, line 45 through column 11, line 8, and see column 11, lines 50-59.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns to include partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns by the teaching of Wang et al, because including partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks, would enable the system to divide digital data into various blocks and perform different compression or decompression operations on different parts of the digital data as desired by the user.

As to claim 2, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the step of operating upon each of the first threads performs lossless compression (see Johns, column 20, lines 46-54.)

As to claim 3, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the step of operating upon each of the first threads independently operates upon each of the plurality of first threads (see Johns, column 18, lines 52-57, and see column 21, lines 52-54, and see Wang et al, column 9, lines 16-30.)

As to claim 6, Johns as modified, teaches the method further comprising the step of combining the compressed blocks in each of the plurality of compressed first threads to obtain digitally compressed data (see Johns, figure 6, and see column 14, lines 52-55, where

"combining the plurality of compressed first threads" is read on "compressed chunks are linked together in a linked list format".)

As to claim 7, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the step of creating the plurality of first threads includes the step of associating each of the plurality of blocks of digital data with one of the plurality of first threads such that blocks within each of the plurality of first threads share certain common compression characteristics (see Johns, column 7, lines 62-66.)

As to claim 16, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the step of partitioning data includes the step of determining a size of each of the plurality of blocks taking data type of each block into account (see Johns, column 10, lines 45-59, and see Wang et al, column 13, lines 32-42.)

As to claim 47, Johns as modified, teaches wherein each first thread further includes control signals (see Johns, column 7, lines 62-66, where "control signal" is read on "control data".)

As to claim 48, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the control signals in each first thread include a compression routine control signal indicating a compression routine to be used in the step of operating (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14.)

As to claim 49, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14) indicate different compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6, where "different compression routines" is read on "lossy or lossless compression methods".)

As to claim 50, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14) indicate a same compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6. It is inherent that when the "compression routine control signal" has the same value for the different first threads, the same compression routine will be used for the different first threads.)

As to claims 51 and 52, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the first threads include blocks of data containing different types of data (see Johns, column 5, lines 45-57, and see Wang et al, column 25, lines 3-5.)

As to claim 53, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of first threads include blocks of data that do not share common compression characteristics (see Johns, column 5, lines 45-47, where Johns teaches different first threads include blocks of data containing

different types of data, and see column 6, lines 1-6, where "compression routine control signal" is taught. It is inherent that when the "compression routine control signal" has a different value for the different first threads, the compression routine, and therefore the compression characteristics will be different for the different first threads.)

5. Claims 4-5, 11-13 and 55-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289) in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657), as applied to claims 1-3, 6-7, 16, and 47-53 above and further in view of Simms (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,280.)

As to claim 4, Johns as modified, still does not teach wherein at least certain ones of the threads are independently operated upon in parallel.

Simms teaches a method for appending data to compressed records (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel (see column 17, lines 16-20, and see column 19, lines 27-33.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, to include at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, by the teachings of Simms, because having at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel,

would improve the system performance, resulting in a more efficient compression of the data in a reduced time period than a single compression process.

As to claim 5, Johns as modified teaches wherein, during the step of operating, at least two different compression algorithms are used to independently operate upon different first threads (see Johns, column 17, lines 45-51, and see Simms, column 2, lines 5-12, and lines 50-56, column 4, lines 29-55, and see column 5, lines 49-59.)

As to claim 11, Johns as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of creating each of the plurality of first threads uses a data type of each of the plurality of blocks so that each of the first threads contains blocks which have a similar data type.

Simms teaches the step of creating each of the plurality of first threads uses a data type of each of the plurality of blocks so that each of the first threads contains blocks which have a similar data type (see column 7, lines 11-16.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, to include the step of creating each of the plurality of first threads uses a data type of each of the plurality of blocks so that each of the first threads contains blocks which have a similar data type.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, by the teaching of Simms, because having the step of creating each of the plurality of first threads uses a data type of each of the plurality of blocks so that each of the first threads contains blocks which have a similar data

type, would enable the system to categorize data into blocks of data with common characteristics amongst the data items.

As to claim 12, Johns as modified teaches wherein the data type is determined according to header information related to each block (see Simms, column 3, lines 7-14.)

As to claim 13, Johns as modified teaches where the data type is determined by comparing the block data to various predetermined data patterns (see Simms, column 20, lines 8-24.)

As to claim 55, Johns as modified teaches wherein each first thread further includes control signals (see Johns, column 7, lines 62-66, where "control signal" is read on "control data".)

As to claim 56, Johns as modified teaches wherein the control signals in each first thread include a compression routine control signal indicating a compression routine to be used in the step of operating (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14.)

As to claim 57, Johns as modified teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14)

indicate different compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6, where "different compression routines" is read on "lossy or lossless compression methods".)

As to claim 58, Johns as modified teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14) indicate a same compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6. It is inherent that when the "compression routine control signal" has the same value for the different first threads, the same compression routine will be used for the different first threads.)

As to claim 59, Johns as modified teaches wherein different ones of the first threads include blocks of data containing different types of data (see Johns, column 5, lines 45-57.)

As to claim 60, Johns as modified teaches wherein during the step of operating upon each of the plurality of first threads, at least two different compression algorithms (see Johns, column 17, lines 45-53, and see column 18, lines 19-40) are used to independently operate upon first threads (see Johns, column 18, lines 52-57, and see column 21, lines 52-54.)

6. Claims 8-10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289) in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657), as applied to claims 1-3, 6-7, 16, and 47-53 above, and further in view of Morikawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,043,897.)

As to claims 8 and 14, Johns as modified, still does not teach the method further including the step of predicting an estimated compression time and estimated compression amount for each block.

Morikawa et al teaches an image forming apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches the step of predicting an estimated compression time (see column 2, lines 14-18) and estimated compression amount for each block (see column 5, lines 57-63.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, to include the step of predicting an estimated compression time and estimated compression amount for each block.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, by the teaching of Morikawa et al, because including the step of predicting an estimated compression time and estimated compression amount for each block would enable the system to provide the user with information associated with compression of each block of data, as to how long the compression would take and how large the size of the compressed data would be after performing the operation on the block of data.

As to claims 9 and 15, Johns as modified teaches wherein the step of creating the plurality of first threads also uses estimated compression time and estimated compression amount to determine which blocks should be associated with the same first thread (see Morikawa et al, column 2, lines 4-18.)

As to claim 10, Johns as modified teaches wherein the estimated compression time and estimated compression amount are made based upon a selected compression algorithm, and wherein the step of predicting includes the step of determining whether a proposed estimated completion time that is based upon one of the compression algorithms available for selection will allow for a desired compression amount to be achieved within a desired compression time for the digital data (see Morikawa et al, column 2, lines 7-17.)

7. Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289 B1) in view of Notenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,433.)

As to claims 39 and 40, Johns teaches a method of operating upon digital data (see column 4, lines 58-63) comprising the steps of:

compressing the digital data using a predetermined compression algorithm to obtain compressed digital data (see column 5, lines 45-47); and

decompressing the compressed digital data using a corresponding decompression algorithm to obtain the digital data (see column 5, lines 47-48.)

Johns does not teach:

compressing the digital data using multiple passes; and

decompressing the compressed digital data using a single pass.

Notenboom teaches a compression and decompression technique (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

compressing the digital data using multiple passes (see Abstract and see column 3, lines 23-39); and

decompressing the compressed digital data using a single pass (see Abstract, and see column 2, lines 24-30.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns to include compressing the digital data using multiple passes; and decompressing the compressed digital data using a single pass.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns by the teaching of Notenboom because including compressing the digital data using multiple passes; and decompressing the compressed digital data using a single pass, would enable the user to use multiple sequential passes to compress data into digital form. For example, in a first pass, the text is run-length compressed. In a second pass, the compressed text is further compressed with key phrase compression. In a third pass, the compressed text is further compressed with Huffman compression. As taught by Notenboom, "Sequential compressing of the text minimizes the storage space required for the file" and "decompressing of the text performed in a single pass" increase the speed of its output in providing full text to a user (see Abstract.)

As to claim 41, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the means for compressing (see Johns, column 5, lines 45-47) includes:

an interface controller (see Johns, column 2, lines 64-66, where "an interface controller" is read on "a virtual frame buffer controller"); and

a compression engine (see Johns, column 21, lines 36-38.)

As to claim 42, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the compression engine comprises a single central processing unit (see Johns, column 4, lines 31-36.)

As to claim 43, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the compression engine comprises a plurality of central processing units (see Johns, column 4, lines 20-25.)

As to claim 44, Johns as modified, teaches wherein each of the plurality of central processing units operate upon a different plurality of threads (see Johns, column 4, lines 20-25, where it is inherent that "other computer system configurations" operate upon different threads.)

As to claim 45, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the plurality of central processing units comprise a plurality of digital signal processors (see Johns, column 9, lines 52-61.)

As to claim 46, Johns teaches a method of allowing a compression system to operate more efficiently (see Abstract) comprising the steps of:

obtaining metadata representative of patterns in first digital data obtained from the compression of the first digital data in a first compression system (see column 6, lines 1-16, where he teaches "metadata" as "information about the chunk" of data, which is stored in a "chunk control data"); and

distributing the metadata to the a compression system so that the compression system can use the metadata to compress second digital data which the compression system needs to compress (see column 6, lines 29-35.)

For the teaching of a plurality of compression systems, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussion regarding "multiple compression passes", made in claim 1 above,

8. Claims 61 and 67-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289 B1) in view of Notenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,433), as applied to claims 39-45 above, and further in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657.)

As to claim 61, Johns as modified, still does not teach:

partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and

creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks.

Wang et al teaches system and process for delivering digital data on demand (see Abstract), in which he teaches:

partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks (see column 16, lines 50-65 and see column 25, lines 3-5); and

creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks (see figure 1B; see column 10, line 45 through column 11, line 8, and see column 11, lines 50-59.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, to include partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, by the teaching of Wang et al, because including partitioning the digital data into a plurality of blocks; and creating a plurality of first threads, such that each first thread includes at least one of the plurality of blocks, would enable the system to divide digital data into various blocks and perform different compression or decompression operations on different parts of the digital data as desired by the user.

As to claim 67, Johns as modified, teaches wherein each first thread has an associated first metadata set (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6.)

As to claim 68, Johns as modified, teaches wherein each first metadata set a passes required variable (see Johns, column 6, lines 11-16, where he teaches "metadata" as

"information about the chunk" of data, which is stored in a "chunk control data". This stored information, as taught by Johns, includes "pertinent information about a chunk such as the format of pixels within the chunk, its compression format, and the memory location of the chunk's pixels in physical memory".)

As to claim 69, Johns as modified, teaches wherein each first thread further includes control signals (see Johns, column 7, lines 62-66, where "control signal" is read on "control data".)

As to claim 70, Johns as modified, teaches wherein the control signals in each first thread include a compression routine control signal indicating a compression routine to be used in the step of operating (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14.)

As to claim 71, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14) indicate different compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6, where "different compression routines" is read on "lossy or lossless compression methods".)

As to claim 72, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the compression routine control signals (see Johns, column 19, lines 10-56, where "compression routine control signal" is read on "compression type parameter", and see column 22, lines 11-14) indicate a same compression routines for different first threads (see Johns, column 6, lines 1-6. It is inherent that when the "compression routine control signal" has the same value for the different first threads, the same compression routine will be used for the different first threads.)

As to claim 73, Johns as modified, teaches wherein different ones of the first threads include blocks of data containing different types of data (see Johns, column 5, lines 45-57.)

9. Claims 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (U.S. patent No. 6,366,289 B1) in view of Notenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,433), and further in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657), as applied to claims 61 and 67-73 above, and still further in view of Simms (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,280.)

As to claim 62, Johns as modified, still does not teach wherein at least certain ones of the threads are independently operated upon in parallel.

Simms teaches a method for appending data to compressed records (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel (see column 17, lines 16-20, and see column 19, lines 27-33.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, to include at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Johns as modified, by the teachings of Simms, because having at least certain ones of the first threads are independently operated upon in parallel, would improve the system performance, resulting in a more efficient compression of the data in a reduced time period than a single compression process.

As to claim 63, Johns as modified teaches wherein during the step of operating upon each of the plurality of first threads, at least two different compression algorithms (see Johns, column 17, lines 45-53, and see column 18, lines 19-40) are used to independently operate upon first threads (see Johns, column 18, lines 52-57, and see column 21, lines 52-54.)

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 17-38, 54 and 64-66 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Johns (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,289), Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,657), Notenboom (U.S. Patent No. 5,109,433), Simms (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,280), and Morikawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,043,897), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

operating upon each of the compressed first threads to eliminate each of the compressed first threads and retain the compressed first blocks;

creating a plurality of second threads, such that each second thread includes at least one of the plurality of compressed first blocks; and

operating upon each of the plurality of second threads to obtain a plurality of compressed second threads, each compressed second thread including at least one compressed second block of digital data, as recited in dependent claims 17 and 64.

Claims 18-38 and 54 are objected to because they are dependents from the objected to dependent claim 17.

Claims 65 and 66 are objected to because they are dependents from the objected to dependent claim 64.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments presented in the Appeal Brief on 17-March-2005 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (571) 272-4083.

tm

May 10, 2005

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100